Appl. No. 10/655,982
Amdt. Dated Jan. 17, 2007
Reply to Office Action of Oct. 17, 2006

Attorney Docket No. 89194.0002
Customer No.: 53720

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claim 1 is amended and claim 7 is canceled. Claims 1-6 and 8 are pending in the application. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application, as amended, are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. The Examiner stated that claim 1 failed to provide a practical application that produces a useful, tangible and concrete result. In response, the applicant amends claim 1 to add a step of "displaying the calculated total trust value of the target web document to a web user or storing the calculated total trust value of the target web document in a database." This amendment is supported by the specification at, for example, page 18, lines 25-28, as well as the original claim 7.[1] The applicant submits that this additional step produces a useful, tangible and concrete result and as such, amended claim 1 satisfies 35 U.S.C. §101.

Claims 1-7 were rejected as being obvious over Hegli et al. (US 6606659) in view of Pirolli et al. (US 5835905) and in view of Manahan (US 2002/0124172). Claim 8 was rejected as being obvious over Hegli et al. (US 6606659) in view of Pirolli et al. (US 5835905) and in view of Tilt et al. (US 6360235). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

The instant application relates to a method of evaluating "trust of a target web document." The method defines "a plurality of trust attributes for the target web document, the plurality of trust attributes being categorized in a first category which relates to contents of the web document, a second category which relates to owner of the web document, and a third category which relates to relationships of the web document and certificate authorities." The method "obtain[s] trust attribute values of at least some of the trust attributes," and performs various calculations using the trust attribute values and "calculate[s] a total trust value of the target web document." As explained in the specification, "the main function of the trust metadata, i.e., a set of trust attributes, is to specify information regarding the trustworthiness of a web document." (Specification at page 4, lines 5-7.)

To the contrary, the cited patents are unrelated to evaluating trust attributes of a webpage. The primary reference, Hegli et al., describes analyzing the content of web pages to evaluate the

---

[1] The original claim 7, together with other dependent claims, was rejected as being dependent on claim 1, but the Examiner did not provide independent reasons for rejecting the claim under §101. This is believed to be improper, as a dependent claim (such as claim 7) may recite additional subject matter, thereby satisfying §101, even if the independent does not.

Appl. No. 10/655,982
Amdt. Dated Jan. 17, 2007
Reply to Office Action of Oct. 17, 2006

Attorney Docket No. 89194.0002
Customer No.: 53720

relevance of the web page to a focus document. The method applies predefined criteria to the document vectors (document meta information) to create lists of "similar" types of documents. (See Abstract.) The examiner cites Figs. 2, 3 and col. 8, lines 30-48 of Hegli et al., but the applicant respectfully submits that the "categories" described in Hegli et al. relate to the content of the page, such as "sports", "shopping", "leisure", "religion", etc. (see Fig. 3, Category ID Table 205). Hegli et al. do not teach or suggest a method of evaluating "trust of a target web document," and do not teach or suggest defining "a plurality of trust attributes for the target web document," much less categorizing the plurality of trust attributes in first, second and third categories, as recited in claim 1 of the instant application. In particular, the claimed third category of trust attributes relates to relationships of the web document and certificate authorities. There is no such disclosure in Hegli et al.

Pirolli et al. is also unrelated to evaluating trust of a target web document. Pirolli et al. describe a "system for extracting and analyzing information from a collection of linked documents at a locality to enable categorization of documents and prediction of documents relevant to a focus document." (Abstract.) Pirolli et al. do not teach or suggest a method of evaluating "trust of a target web document," and do not teach or suggest defining "a plurality of trust attributes for the target web document."

Manahan describes a method for signing and validating web pages. In one embodiment, a web page that includes a trigger is digitally signed with a private key to provide a digital signature. The web page, digital signature, and a digital certificate are transmitted from a first computer system to a second computer system. On the second computer system, in response to the trigger, the digital signature is automatically verified using a public key corresponding to the private key. (Abstract.) The portion relied on by the Examiner, i.e. Figs. 2, 3 and paragraph 0027, merely describes using a digital certificate. Manahan does not describe "defining a plurality of trust attributes for the target web document, the plurality of trust attributes being categorized in a first category which relates to contents of the web document, a second category which relates to owner of the web document, and a third category which relates to relationships of the web document and certificate authorities" as recited in claim 1 of the instant application. In particular, Manahan does not teach or suggest the claimed third category of trust attributes which "relates to relationships of the web document and certificate authorities".

Appl. No. 10/655,982
Amdt. Dated Jan. 17, 2007
Reply to Office Action of Oct. 17, 2006

Attorney Docket No. 89194.0002
Customer No.: 53720

Tilt et al. describes a method of "objectively determining attributes of a Web site" to determine an "objective effectiveness of the Web site." "A Web site … is spidered to determine all objects and hyperlinks associated with the Web site and an index is constructed to represent the Web site. The Web site is then analyze to discern scenes, similar to page views, and links that connect the scenes. Information is then collected of the relationships of the scenes that reflects human factors, such as wait times and hyperlink location. This relationship information is quantified and associated with the hyperlinks and scenes. A model is then constructed of the scenes and hyperlinks and the quantified relationship information is applied to the model. An objective effectiveness of the Web site is then calculated by mathematical treatment of the model. A preferred model is a graph theory model having vertices and edges." (Abstract.) Tilt et al. do not teach or suggest a method of evaluating "trust of a target web document," and do not teach or suggest defining "a plurality of trust attributes for the target web document" as recited in claim 1 of the instant application.

In summary, the applicant respectfully submits that the cited references, either taken alone or in combination, do not teach the method claimed in claim 1 of the present application. Accordingly, claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-6 and 8 are patentable over the cited references.

The art made of record but not relied upon by the Examiner has been considered. However, it is submitted that this art neither describes nor suggests the presently claimed invention.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application, as amended, are requested. If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the Los Angeles, California telephone number (213) 625-5076 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance.

Appl. No. 10/655,982
Amdt. Dated Jan. 17, 2007
Reply to Office Action of Oct. 17, 2006

Attorney Docket No. 89194.0002
Customer No.: 53720

If there are any fees due in connection with the filing of this response or deficient in fees, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-3531.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 17, 2007

By: /Ying Chen/
        Ying Chen
        Registration No. 50,193
        Attorney for Applicant(s)

255 S. Grand Ave., #215
Los Angeles, CA 90012
Phone: 213-625-5076
Fax: 213-625-0691